DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 109 HE 022 135

TITLE Annual Report on Program Activities, 1986-87. The Twelfth in a Series of Reports to the Legislature and the Governor on Program Review by Commission Staff and California's Public Colleges and Universities. Report No. 87-28.

INSTITUTION California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.

PUB DATE Jun 88

NOTE 31p.

AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, CA 95814-3985 (free).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *College Programs; Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; Educational Development; Higher Education; Policy Formation; *Program Evaluation; Public Colleges; Public Policy; State Departments of Education; *State Programs; State Universities; *Statewide Planning

IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

The twelfth in a series of annual reports on the program review activities of the California State Postsecondary Education Commission staff and the three public segments of higher education is presented, covering proposals for 50 new degree/certificate programs submitted to the Commission between July 1986 and June 1987. Four recommendations are offered: (1) the Chancellor's Office of the California community colleges should increase its efforts toward improving program review practices and procedures on all campuses; (2) with all campuses in the University and State University having established schedules for the systematic review of existing programs, segmental offices should seek to insure uniformity in the quality of campus reviews by developing guidelines and regulations to be distributed to the campuses and other parties; (3) segmental offices should encourage all campuses to define more precisely the knowledge and skills expected of graduates of each degree program; (4) segmental offices should undertake as many systemwide reviews of programs in selected fields as resources allow. Three appendices are: proposals for new programs submitted to the Commission, July 1, 1986 to June 30, 1987; undergraduate program review criteria, College of Letters and Science, University of California, Davis; and projected programs, University of California and the California State University, 1986-1990. Contains 8 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED303109

ANNUAL REPORT ON PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITIES 1986-87

1. Commission Reviews of Proposals for New Programs
2. Segmental Reviews of Existing Programs
3. Commission Reviews of Plans for Projected Programs
4. Recommendations for Future Action

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Calif Postsecondary Education Commission
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Executive Summary

This is the twelfth in a series of annual reports on the program review activities of Commission staff and the three public segments of higher education. It includes a discussion of proposals for 50 new degree or certificate programs submitted to the Commission between July 1, 1986, and June 30, 1987 (pages 1-2); a summary of several hundred reviews of existing programs on University and State University campuses during the same period (pages 3-6); a section dealing with 178 projected programs (pages 7-12); and the following four recommendations for segmental action during the coming year (page 13):

1. The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges should increase its efforts toward improving program review practices and procedures on all campuses. As soon as possible, the Chancellor's Office should compile and submit to the Commission the following items essential for statewide planning and review: (1) a list of projected programs at all colleges, with a brief descriptive statement for each program; and (2) a summary of program review activities at each college during the preceding year.

2. With all campuses in the University and State University having established schedules for the systematic review of existing programs, segmental offices should seek to insure uniformity in the quality of campus reviews by developing guidelines and regulations to be distributed to the campuses and other parties. These might take the form of a handbook that identifies program elements to be evaluated, lists reporting requirements and deadlines, and brings together other information designed to strengthen the review process on all campuses.

3. Segmental offices should encourage all campuses to define more precisely the knowledge and skills expected of graduates of each degree program with a view toward including performance measures of a program's majors as a common element in the review process. One such measure should be the placement and career experiences of graduates.

4. Segmental offices should undertake as many systemwide reviews of programs in selected fields as resources allow.

The Commission adopted this report on June 13, 1988, on recommendation of its Policy Evaluation Committee. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Library of the Commission at (916) 322-8031. Further information about the substance of the report may be obtained from Norman Charles of the Commission staff at (916) 322-8020.

ANNUAL REPORT ON PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITIES, 1986-87

The Twelfth in a Series of Reports to the Legislature and the Governor on Program Review by Commission Staff and California's Public Colleges and Universities

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

COMMISSION REPORT 87-28
PUBLISHED JUNE 1988

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 88-28 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

1. Review of Proposals for New Programs 1

   Trends in Proposals for New Programs 1

   Proposals of Each Segment 1

2. Review of Existing Programs 3

   The Commission's Role in the Review of Existing Programs 4

   Segmental Review Activities During 1986-87 5

3. Review of Projected Programs 7

   Projected Programs, 1988-1993 7

   Projected Programs Requiring Commission Review 7

4. Recommendations for Segmental Action During the Coming Year 13

Appendices

A. Proposals for New Programs Submitted to the Commission, July 1, 1986, to June 30, 1987 15

B. Undergraduate Program Review Criteria, College of Letters and Science, University of California, Davis 19

C. Projected Programs, University of California and the California State University, 1986-1990 21

References 27

1 *Review of Proposals for New Programs*

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is required by Section 66903(6) of the *Education Code* to "review proposals by the public segments for new programs and make recommendations regarding such proposals to the Legislature and Governor." Shortly after its formation, the Commission requested the staff to prepare an annual report describing its activities relating to that review function. This is the twelfth in the series of annual reports. It summarizes the program review and planning activities of the staff and of the public segments for the period between July 1, 1986, and June 30, 1987, and concludes with recommendations for segmental action during the coming academic year.

Trends in proposals for new programs

A total of 50 proposals for new programs were submitted to the Commission for review in 1986-87. This number, while considerably below the levels of ten years ago, is in line with segmental totals for the past few years (Display 1).

The new programs are in a broad range of academic and occupational fields, with the health sciences -- thanks to the ten proposals in these subjects from the Community Colleges -- again claiming a greater number of new programs than any other curricular area. For the second year in a row, only a modest number of proposals for new programs in computer sciences -- two from community colleges and one from the State University -- were forwarded to the Commission.

Again this year, a majority of new programs have been offered as options or concentrations within other degree programs. Such programs not only have demonstrated their viability, but in most cases can be offered with no additional faculty or resources.

Proposals of each segment

Appendix A on pages 15-18 lists all of the 1986-87 proposals by campus, program, and date submitted, and presents selected comments by Commission staff on the proposals.

University of California

The five proposals from the University in 1986-87 included one for a Ph.D. program in human development (Davis) and proposals for master's and Ph.D. programs in materials (Santa Barbara), environmental toxicology, biomedical sciences (both at Riverside), and Pacific international affairs (San Diego).

It is worth noting that all of these programs are heavily interdisciplinary; the program in human development, for example, plans to draw faculty from as many as eight separate departments. As noted in previous reports, the trend in curricular develop-

DISPLAY 1 Number of Proposals for New Programs Received from Each Public Segment Since 1976-77

Year	California Community Colleges	The California State University	University of California	Total
1976-77	93	29	17	139
1977-78	101	20	15	136
1978-79	55	17	13	85
1979-80	43	16	12	71
1980-81	51	17	9	77
1981-82	43	11	5	62
1982-83	32	27	8	65
1983-84	16	23	6	45
1984-85	25	22	4	51
1985-86	27	9	7	43
1986-87	26	19	5	50

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission files.

ment has clearly been toward programs with combinations of courses that transcend the boundaries of traditional disciplines and departments -- further evidence of what Clifford Geertz has called the "blurring of genres" in contemporary thought (1980).

The Master of Pacific International Affairs and the Ph.D. in International Affairs at San Diego are the degree programs offered by the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies. (The proposal for the establishment of this school was discussed in last year's annual report.) After an initial review of the proposal for programs, Commission staff requested further explanation of the staffing process as planned by the campus, since the proposal called for an uncommonly large number of new faculty. The University's response outlined the process in satisfactory detail, but the plan still seemed to provide exceptionally rich faculty-student ratios during the early years of the School's operation. Acknowledging the difficulty of achieving an immediate balance when staffing a new school, Commission staff urged greater restraint in adding new faculty than the plan proposed, noting that, all the while, prospects for the school and its programs seemed quite favorable.

The California State University

After an unusually small number of proposals for new programs in 1985-86, the State University returned to normal levels with 19 proposals in 1986-87. While more than one-third of the new programs are in engineering and industrial technology fields, others, including several distinctive programs, are distributed across the curriculum from biochemistry to interior design. Among programs new to the State University are offerings in rural and town planning, national security studies, and a master's degree program in liberal arts designed primarily for adults -- especially businessmen, teachers, and military personnel -- seeking to broaden their education.

Other proposals of interest were those from the Stanislaus and San Bernardino campuses for "2+2" programs which offer upper-division courses to those who have completed lower-division technical courses at a Community College or other institution.

California Community Colleges

Among the 26 proposals from Community Colleges, ten were for programs in the health sciences and six others were for technology programs in such fields as manufacturing, computer, electronics, or mechanical technology. A similar pattern has been evident for several years with more new programs in the health sciences, broadly defined, than in any other curricular area. Examples include programs with occupational titles such as home health aide, surgical technology, medical assistant, nursing home health aide, and pharmacy technician.

Some of the issues identified in last year's report -- definition of a program, variations in credit requirements for the certificate, and appropriate documentation of need in program proposals -- are still being discussed with Chancellor's Office staff.

2 *Review of Existing Programs*

OVER the past 20 years, the periodic evaluation of each degree program offered by a college or university has become a standard feature of academic life. Although some form of curricular review is a long standing practice on well-governed campuses, public and legislative interest in the process is a relatively recent development, as is external pressure on public campuses to schedule systematic reviews. Reinforced by a renewed emphasis on quality, accountability, and efficiency in public institutions, this trend has been promoted in large part by governing boards and State coordinating agencies, many of which have come into being since 1970. In a majority of states, in fact, such agencies are themselves responsible for the review of campus programs.

In California, all campuses of the University and State University have established schedules for the review of existing programs on a five to seven year cycle. (A State University Trustees' action in 1971 requiring such review of all campuses was among the first of its kind in the country). While a few Community College districts are known to have excellent review procedures in place, there is as yet no record of the nature and extent of such procedures throughout the system.

Among the standard purposes of regularly scheduled reviews are a reconsideration of goals and objectives of individual degree programs, an examination of evidence on how effectively programs are achieving them, and a determination of what is needed to increase the program's effectiveness or -- in extreme cases -- whether the program should be continued. Only rarely does a regularly scheduled review lead to a recommendation that a program be discontinued. Although some campuses employ teams of outside evaluators to bring greater objectivity to the process, most reviews are conducted by teams of campus faculty and administrators. The department offering the program ordinarily prepares a self-study that is reviewed by the review team, or in some cases, by only the dean. Under these circumstances, it is inevitable that a vast majority of reviews will recommend continuation of programs without change or suggest steps to strengthen them -- not that they be terminated.

For a time it was assumed that systematic program review, if it led to an annual pruning of the curriculum, could result in significant savings. That assumption has not been borne out in public institutions with enrollment-based funding formulas because unless the elimination of programs also leads to a reduction in enrollments and, in turn, to fewer budgeted faculty positions, no savings will be realized. Virtually none of the discontinued programs in the University or State University in recent years has involved any loss of staff positions, since most of them have been marginal, low-enrollment programs. Thus, while current review procedures are unlikely to reduce budgets, they are nevertheless valuable as a guide to the allocation of resources.

Program review may also take on new significance as it relates to assessment -- a topic that has recently captured broad attention. Advocates of a more comprehensive approach to assessment argue that current measurement practices do not tell enough about how well a campus is fulfilling its primary responsibility -- the education of students. The argument is not that students are not now subjected to enough tests; it is that on most campuses these examinations are strictly course related and that there is no measure of a student's overall growth and development during the college years, no reliable system of accounting for the "value added" by the collegiate experience.

Since the review of degree programs should focus on the effectiveness of a given department in educating its majors, some feel that such review could become a more essential element in the assessment of student learning than it often is. It is true that program evaluations have tended to emphasize process measures rather than product measures -- thoroughness of curriculum, adequacy of library and equipment, counseling of students, reputations of faculty, and the like, rather than the overall competence, skill, knowledge and career satisfaction of the program's graduates. This emphasis is illustrated by the list of

program elements recommended by the Teaching Program Planning and Review Committee, College of Letters and Science at UC, Davis as basic considerations in the review of all programs, a list in many ways exemplary of program review as currently conducted. (The list is reproduced in Appendix B.)

Before the present interest in assessment subsides, it seems likely that institutions will come under increasing pressure to develop "output" or "performance" measures that indicate more clearly than does currently available evidence how students have grown during their time on campus. Program review can contribute in an important way to this process if one of the elements to be evaluated is a department's efforts to define and measure more precisely and reliably the knowledge and skills expected of its graduates.

Both the University and State University allow campuses to adopt their own criteria and follow their own procedures in reviewing programs, requiring only that each establish a formal schedule and report the results of all reviews. While the procedures of program review must naturally be adjusted to distinctive organizational structures on individual campuses, it is reasonable to expect that the program elements to be examined should be similar. Especially within a multi-campus system, it is important to insure that practices affecting quality are reasonably consistent and uniform on all campuses. The Commission has for some time been encouraging steps toward that end, including one as elemental as the publication of a systemwide program review handbook which would outline the necessary components of each review, list reporting requirements, and identify procedures that have proved effective.

The President's Office of the University has been updating and revising a program review handbook originally issued ten years ago.

The State University has been conducting a systemwide evaluation of review procedures. The report of the ten-member committee, expected soon, may encourage increased effectiveness and consistency of a process that while depending to a great extent on campus initiative and concern, can also benefit from guidance and direction from a central source.

The Commission's role in the review of existing programs

Unlike its counterpart agencies in a growing number of states, the Commission has no authority to conduct reviews of existing programs on individual campuses. It has instead, as directed in the *Education Code*, worked with segmental offices to "establish a schedule for the segmental review of selected programs, evaluate the program review process of the segments, and report its findings to the Governor and Legislature." The Commission's guidelines for the review of existing programs in *The Commission's Role in the Review of Degree and Certificate Programs* (1981) define this role in detail and indicate the importance the Commission attaches to systematic curricular review. Among other procedures, these guidelines require each segment to include with its annual academic master plan a list of all programs scheduled for review on each campus during the next two years. In addition, each segment is to submit an annual summary of review activities on all campuses, including as much information as possible about the nature and extent of each review along with its conclusions and recommendations.

While the Community Colleges have been as yet unable to submit any of this information, the University and State University have responded in every detail to the provisions of the guidelines. Their annual reports show that all of their campuses have at least established schedules for the systematic review of all programs. They reveal also, however, a variety of approaches to the review process, some clearly less thorough and objective than others. Thus, in fulfilling the Commission's responsibility to evaluate the review processes of the segments, and convinced that this process is as central to educational quality as any other campus activity, the Commission staff will continue to encourage uniformity and thoroughness in the segments' review of existing programs.

Another recurrent recommendation in the Commission's annual report on program review has been to urge each segment to undertake frequent systemwide reviews of programs in selected disciplines.

Despite the major commitment of time, energy, and resources required by such reviews, their value is unquestionable, as evidenced by recent systemwide reviews in such fields as education, engineering,

law, and the performing arts, to mention a few. Among their other advantages, they bring a perspective to bear on the evaluation of programs that is difficult to achieve on an individual campus. In a multi-campus institution, it is essential for many reasons to know the characteristics and relative strength of programs in the same discipline on the various campuses.

A procedure for conducting an even more inclusive review -- of all programs in a given field in all three public segments -- is outlined in *The Commission's Role in the Review of Degree and Certificate Programs*. That such a broad-based intersegmental review has yet to be attempted is due not to a rejection of the concept but to a limitation of staff and resources. Commission staff continues to explore the possibilities of such a project.

Segmental review activities during 1986-87

University of California

The Office of the President's report to the Commission on review activities throughout the University in 1986-87 lists for each degree program reviewed on each campus, the reasons for the review and who conducted it, the criteria applied, and the major findings and recommendations. The overall impression conveyed by this material is that of a serious commitment on most campuses to the conscientious, systematic evaluation of the curriculum. With the exception of the two campuses that reviewed no undergraduate programs in 1986-87, most others appear to have covered enough programs during the period to allow them to adhere to approximately a five- to seven-year cycle for reviewing each program.

Again with one or two exceptions, most campuses are reporting the findings and recommendations of each review in more detail than was the case earlier. While some findings must remain confidential, it is only through a candid summary of the conclusions of a review team that the rigor and objectivity of the review can be surmised by those not party to the process.

No programs were discontinued on any University campus during 1986-87.

The California State University

An account of all programs reviewed on State University campuses is presented annually to the Board of Trustees at its March meeting. The March 1988 report summarizes the results of more than 170 program evaluations conducted throughout the system in 1986-87. While this systemwide total is greater than in most recent years, four campuses reviewed only two or three programs each -- a level of effort that makes it virtually impossible to cover the curriculum every five years.

There also remains an unevenness in the reporting practices of the campuses. In summarizing the findings of each review, most campuses have become admirably thorough and forthright, but a few still seem reluctant to record a negative comment. The credibility of the review process suffers on those campuses that, in summarizing the review findings for 10 or 12 individual programs, mention not a single weakness in any of them.

In harmony with a Commission recommendation in last year's annual report, more of the review summaries commented on the placement records of a program's graduates than heretofore. This indication of a program's effectiveness, while certainly not a new criterion, is likely to assume greater importance as one of several "outcome" measures -- a topic, as noted earlier, currently in the spotlight.

For the second year in a row, no programs were discontinued in the State University.

Three projects related to program planning and review within the State University are still in progress: a systemwide study of campus review practices, a study of the need for additional engineering programs and facilities, and a review of graduate education within the system.

3 *Review of Projected Programs*

FOR the past ten years, the University and State University have been submitting to the Commission master lists of programs projected for initiation a year or more in the future. Commission staff has reviewed these lists and identified in its annual reports those programs that appear to represent possible unnecessary duplication, are of questionable need, or -- for a variety of reasons including their distinctive or unfamiliar titles -- seem to require special review.

In the 1981 revision of its guidelines, the Commission requested that each listed program be accompanied by a brief descriptive statement that contains "a description of the program and the reasons for proposing it, the relationship of the program to existing programs and to the mission of the campus, its new staff and facilities requirements, and the possible date for the program's initiation." The University and State University have complied with this request by providing descriptive statements that have proved invaluable not only to Commission staff but also, it is hoped, to campuses preparing them.

Projected programs, 1988-1993

The complete list of projected programs, attached as Appendix C, is longer than any such list during the past decade. The 178 programs projected for initiation between 1988 and 1993 represent a 72 percent increase over the number of programs on the list five years ago. The steadily increasing number of projected programs might be due to the cumulative effect of some being delayed in their initiation and carried over from year to year. But the 100 programs newly added to this list this year are far more than in any recent year and reflect a climate of expansiveness markedly different from the mood of the early 1980s.

Although the list shows new program activity to be distributed among a somewhat broader array of disciplines than has been the case, the largest concentration of programs continues to be in three discipline areas: the health professions, the visual and performing arts, and engineering and computer science.

Each of these fields presents somewhat different challenges in considering the need for new programs.

In the health sciences, the variety of specialized fields and their interrelationships, the subtle dynamics of the job market, the high costs, and the number and diversity of institutions offering programs make the planning and review of new programs in the health sciences as difficult as in any other field.

Projected programs in the arts present a different set of issues. Estimating societal demand is even more uncertain than in other fields because it is impossible to forecast how many painters, actors, musicians, or sculptors will be "needed." Furthermore, a majority of projected programs are for professional degree programs to be added to, or to replace, existing liberal arts programs in the subject. Many of these seem to be responding to demands for increased specialization and the pressures of professional accrediting bodies.

In the fields of engineering and computer science, the challenge is to determine if the strong student and market demand of the past decade might level off and diminish the need for additional programs. These are also fields in which a potential competition for resources between the University and State University is especially keen. For that reason, among others, the survey of the field being proposed by the State University is timely.

Projected programs requiring Commission review

One of the purposes of developing lists of projected programs is to identify those that require Commission staff review and those that from a statewide perspective seem to raise no serious questions. The

list in Display 2 below includes projected programs that for reasons indicated should be reviewed with special care by campuses, segmental offices, and Commission staff. Appearing here are all proposals for doctoral and joint doctoral programs, which by their very nature require careful consideration at all levels of the review process. Others are grouped generally according to the major reason Commission staff feels they need special attention, although it may not be the only reason.

The appearance of a program on this list implies no judgment whatever about its possible quality or the ability of the campus to offer it. Nor does it necessarily indicate that the program is less likely to be endorsed at any level of the review process than a program not on the list. It is meant to emphasize that proposals for these programs should contain an especially convincing statement of purpose and need.

If proposals for any projected programs not on the list in Display 2 are approved by the segments, these should be sent to the Commission in summary form for possible comment, but primarily for information.

DISPLAY 2 Projected Programs Requiring Commission Staff Review

Projected Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date
Joint Doctoral Programs			
Educational Leadership	Ph.D.	UC Systemwide and CSU Fresno	To be determined
Engineering and Applied Math	Ph.D.	CSULB and Claremont	1989
Communicative Disorders	Ph.D.	San Diego State & USC	1989
Public Health	Ph.D.	San Diego State and UC San Diego	1989
Doctoral Programs			
Conservation and Resource Studies	M.A./Ph.D.	UC Berkeley	1988
International Studies	M.A./Ph.D.	UC Berkeley	1988
Education	Ph.D.	UC Davis	1988
Epidemiology	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Davis	1988
Linguistics	Ph.D.	UC Davis	1990
Music	Ph.D.	UC Davis	1989
Anthropology	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1991-92
Criminology and Legal Studies	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1990-91
Dramatic Theory and Criticism	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1989-90
East Asian Languages and Literatures	M.A./Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1991-92
Environmental Health and Planning	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1989-90
Geosciences	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1990-91
Health and Clinical Psychology	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1990-91
Human Development	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1989-90
Human Genetic Disease	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1989-90
Sociology	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1991-92
Dance	Ph.D.	UC Los Angeles	1990
Educational Administration	Ed.D.	UC Los Angeles	To be determined
Music	D.M.A.	UC Los Angeles	1989 or 1990

continued

DISPLAY 2, Continued

Projected Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date
Genetics	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Riverside	1988
Architecture	Ph.D.	UC San Diego	1991
Art History / Criticism (Visual Arts)	M.A./Ph.D.	UC San Diego	1990
Dramaturgy / Dramatic Literature	Ph.D.or DFA	UC San Diego	1991
Materials Science	M.A./Ph.D.	UC San Diego	1988
Computer Science	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Santa Barbara	1988
Economy and Society	Ph.D.	UC Santa Barbara	1990
Human Communication	Ph.D.	UC Santa Barbara	1989
Linguistics/Linguistic Discourse Analysis	M.A./Ph.D.	UC Santa Barbara	1988
Music	M.M./D.M.A.	UC Santa Barbara	1988
Statistics or Applied Probability	Ph.D.	UC Santa Barbara	1988 or 1989
Aquatic Toxicology	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Santa Cruz	1989-90
Anthropology	M.A./Ph.D.	UC Santa Cruz	1989
Computer Engineering	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Santa Cruz	1988-89
International Economics	Ph.D.	UC Santa Cruz	1991-92
Projected programs in fields with many existing and/or proposed programs			
Architecture			
School of Architecture		UC San Diego,	1988
Architecture	B.A./M.Arch.	UC San Diego	1990
Architecture	B.Arch.	San Diego State University	1989
Architecture	M.Arch.	San Diego State University	1992
Architecture	*Ph.D.*	*UC San Diego*	*1991*
Computer Science/Engineering			
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Bakersfield	1989
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1988
Computer Engineering	B.S.	CSU Fresno	1988
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Fresno	1988
Computer Engineering	B.S.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Hayward	1988
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Long Beach	1988
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Los Angeles	1988
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU San Bernardino	1989
Computer Engineering	M.S.	San Jose State University	1988
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Stanislaus	1988
Computer Science	*M.S./Ph.D.*	*UC Santa Barbara*	*1988*
Computer Engineering	*M.S./Ph.D.*	*UC Santa Cruz*	*1988-89*
Engineering			
Ocean Engineering	B.S.	UC San Diego	1990

continued

DISPLAY 2, Continued

Projected Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date
Ocean Engineering	M.S.	UC San Diego	1994
Electronic Engineering	B.S.	UC Santa Cruz	1990-91
Electrical Engineering	M.S.	CSU Chico	1988
Quality Assurance	M.S.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1988
Construction Management	B.S.	CSU Fresno	1988
Civil Engineering	M.S.	CSU Fresno	1988
Civil Engineering	B.S. / M.S.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Electrical Engineering	B.S. / M.S	CSU Fullerton	1989
Mechanical Engineering	B.S. / M.S.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Civil Engineering	B.S.	Humboldt State University	1989
Engineering Technology	B.S.	CSU Long Beach	1988
Construction Management	B.S.	CSU Sacramento	1988
Industrial Technology	B.S.	San Francisco State Univ.	1988
Quality Assurance	M.S.	San Jose State Univ.	1988
Structural Engineering	M.S.	CSU San Luis Obispo	1989
Engineering and Applied Math	*Ph.D.*	*CSULB and Claremont*	*1989*
Materials Science	*M.A./Ph.D.*	*UC San Diego*	*1988*
Fine and Performing Arts			
Art	B.F.A.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1993
Art	B.F.A.	CSU Northridge	1989
Art	B.F.A.	CSU Sacramento	1989
Art	M.A.	CSU San Bernardino	1989
Art	B.F.A.	CSU Stanislaus	1989
Dance	M.F.A.	UC Los Angeles	1988
Dance	B.A.	CSU Fullerton	1988
Dance	B.F.A.	CSU Long Beach	1988
Dance	M.F.A.	CSU Long Beach	1990
Dance	B.A.	San Diego State University	1988
Dance	*Ph.D.*	*UC Los Angeles*	*1990*
Theatre Arts	B.A.	CSU Bakersfield	1990
Theatre Arts	M.F.A.	CSU Fresno	1990
Theatre Arts	B.F.A.	CSU Northridge	1989
Drama	M.F.A.	San Francisco State University	1988
Dramatic Theory and Criticism	*Ph.D.*	*UC Irvine*	*1989-90*
Dramaturgy / Dramatic Literature	*Ph.D.or D.F.A.*	*UC San Diego*	*1991*
Music	M.M.	UC Los Angeles	1989
Music	B.A.	CSU Bakersfield	1989
Music	M.M.	CSU Los Angeles	1988

continued

DISPLAY 2, Continued

Projected Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date
Music	B.A.	CSU San Luis Obispo	1990
Music	*Ph.D.*	*UC Davis*	*1989*
Music	*D.M.A.*	*UC Los Angeles*	*1989 or 1990*
Music	*M.M./D.M.A.*	*UC Santa Barbara*	*1988*
Pacific Rim Studies			
Asian American Studies	Specialization	UC Los Angeles	1988
Asian Studies	B.A. / M.A.	CSU Los Angeles	1989
Asian Studies	B.A.	CSU Sacramento	1989
Chinese Studies	M.A.	UC San Diego	1989
East Asian Languages and Literatures	B.A.	UC Irvine	1990-91
International Relations & Pacific Studies	Certificate	UC San Diego	1989
Japanese Studies	B.A. / M.A.	UC San Diego	1992
East Asian Languages and Literatures	*M.A./Ph.D.*	*UC Irvine*	*1991-92*
Projected programs in fields with uncertain student or societal demand			
Classical Studies	M.A.	UC San Diego	1993
Communications	M.A.	CSU San Bernardino	1990
Counseling	M.S.	Humboldt State University	1988
Environmental and Occupational Health	B.S.	CSU Northridge	1988
Environmental Design	M.S.	CSU San Luis Obispo	1989
General Studies	B.A.	CSU Stanislaus	1989
Health Science	B.S.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Liberal Studies	M.A.	CSU Long Beach	1990
Liberal Studies	M.A.	CSU Sacramento	1989
Liberal Studies	M.A.	CSU San Luis Obispo	1989
Operations Research	M.A.	UC Santa Barbara	1988 or 1989
Public Health	M.S.	San Diego State University	1988
Recreation Administration	B.A.	Humboldt State University	1988
Social Science	M.A.	CSU San Bernardino	1988
Telecommunications	B.S.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1989
Urban Planning	M.A.	UC Irvine	1988-89
Urban Studies and Planning	M.A.	UC San Diego	1989
Urban Studies	B.A.	San Diego State University	1988
Projected programs in fields currently undergoing public scrutiny or professional review			
Educational Administration	M.A.	CSU Bakersfield	1990
Educational Administration	M.A.	CSU San Bernardino	1988
Education	*Ph.D.*	*UC Davis*	*1988*

continued

DISPLAY 2, Continued

Projected Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date
Educational Administration	*Ed.D.*	*UC Los Angeles*	*To be determined*
Educational Leadership	*Ph.D.*	*UC Systemwide and CSU Fresno*	*To be determined*
Physical Therapy	M.S.	UCSF & SF State University	1988
Physical Therapy	M.P.T.	CSU Fresno	1988
Physical Therapy	M.P.T.	CSU Long Beach	1988
Physical Therapy	M.P.T.	CSU Northridge	1988
Physical Therapy	M.S.	San Diego State University	1989
Physical Therapy	M.S.	SF State & UCSF (above)	1989
Nursing	B.S. / M.S.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1988
Nursing	M.S.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Projected programs in fields where there are few established models			
Art Therapy	M.A.	CSU Los Angeles	1988
Gerontology	M.S.	San Jose State University	1989
Gerontology	M.S.	CSU Stanislaus	1989
Music Theater	B.A.	UC Los Angeles	1989
Photographic Studies	M.A./M.F.A.	UC Riverside	1988
Projected programs requiring substantial increases in faculty or facilities			
Cognitive Science	B.A.	UC San Diego	1989
Environmental Studies	M.A.	UC Santa Barbara	1988
Projected programs in fields with unfamiliar degree titles			
Applied Studies	B.S.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1988
Aviation	B.S.	CSU Los Angeles	1988
Human Resource Development	M.S.	CSU Chico	1989
Social & Behav Sci Communication	Grad Cert	UC Santa Cruz	1989
Social Documentation	M.A.	UC Santa Cruz	1989
Statistics and Actuarial Science	B.S.	UC Santa Barbara	1988 or 1989

Note: Projected doctoral programs are listed in italics at the end of each category other than the first two.

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

4 *Recommendations for Segmental Action During the Coming Year*

THE Commission offers the following four recommendations to the segments:

1. The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges should increase its efforts toward improving program review practices and procedures on all campuses. As soon as possible, the Chancellor's Office should compile and submit to the Commission the following items essential for statewide planning and review: (1) a list of projected programs at all colleges, with a brief descriptive statement for each program; and (2) a summary of program review activities at each college during the preceding year.

2. With all campuses in the University and State University having established schedules for the systematic review of existing programs, segmental offices should seek to insure uniformity in the quality of campus reviews by developing guidelines and regulations to be distributed to the campuses and other parties. These might take the form of a handbook that identifies program elements to be evaluated, lists reporting requirements and deadlines, and brings together other information designed to strengthen the review process on all campuses.

3. Segmental offices should encourage all campuses to define more precisely the knowledge and skills expected of graduates of each degree program with a view toward including performance measures of a program's majors as a common element in the review process. One such measure should be the placement and career experiences of graduates.

4. Segmental offices should undertake as many systemwide reviews of programs in selected fields as resources allow.

Appendix A

Proposals for New Programs Submitted to the Commission, July 1, 1986, to June 30, 1987

Date	Campus	Program	Degree(s)	Commission Staff Comments
University of California				
10/14/86	Davis	Human Development	Ph.D	Drawing faculty from eight departments, this program presents a challenge in maintaining focus and direction. Could however lead to new modes of inquiry if successful. Concur.
2/20/87	Santa Barbara	Materials	M.S./ Ph.D.	This program in a rapidly developing field requires an uncommon number of new courses. Campus is prepared to commit necessary resources. Student interest and market demand are strong. Concur.
5/1/87	San Diego	Pacific International Affairs International Affairs	MPIA Ph.D.	Concur. (See discussion on page 2.)
5/26/87	Riverside	Environmental Toxicology	M.S./ Ph.D.	Proposal contains informative survey of toxicology programs, but limited discussion of actual job prospects. Environmental focus builds on existing campus strengths. Concur.
5/27/87	Riverside	Biomedical Sciences	M.S./ Ph.D.	Rarely offered as a doctoral program, this interdisciplinary grouping focusing on medical sciences seems promising. Proposal was limited in its discussion of employment prospects, probably because few now hold the degree. Concur.
The California State University				
7/1/86	San Francisco	Civil Engineering	B.S.	Proposes elevating these existing specializations within engineering to separate degree programs.
8/8/86	San Bernardino	Foods and Nutrition	B.S.	Student demand and employment prospects justify program.
8/11/86	Bakersfield	Geology	M.S.	The only question about this well-documented proposal for a program which stresses petroleum geology is the depressed condition of the industry. Whether it might be postponed is a decision we will leave to the campus.
9/12/86	Hayward	Special Education	M.S.	Changes existing option under MS in Education to separate degree program.

9/16/86	San Bernardino	National Security Studies	M.A.	Program has been offered for two years as a special major with enrollments coming from Air Force and aerospace industry personnel and from others interested in defense policy analysis.
10/8/86	Long Beach	Biochemistry	B.S.	All necessary courses are already offered.
10/8/86	San Francisco	Gerontology	M.A.	A persuasive proposal for a highly interdisciplinary program which might benefit from a somewhat larger core faculty.
11/26/86	Pomona	Psychology	B.A.	Formerly options within Behavorial Sciences, these are elevated to separate degree programs. Sent as information copy.
12/5/86	San Jose	Aerospace Engineering	B.S.	Program will require only one new course during the first 2 years and complements an existing BS in Aeronautics program. Sent as information copy.
12/8/86	Chico	Construction Management	B.S.	Program has been offered as an option under Industrial Technology.
12/22/86	Chico	Rural and Town Planning	M.A.	The only concern with this interesting and innovative program is whether local governments can afford to employ its graduates.
2/23/87	San Diego	Liberal Arts	M.A.	Designed primarily for persons in business, teaching, and the military, this is the only program of its kind within the State University.
2/24/87	Sacramento	Interior Design	B.A.	Since courses have been offered for many years, program can be implemented with no additional resources. Sent as information copy.
2/24/87	San Luis Obispo	Computer Engineering	B.S.	Campus seems well-equipped to offer program in this still thriving field without a major commitment of new resources. Concur.
2/27/87	San Jose	Child Development	B.A.	Former concentration under Social Science; enrollments justify a separate program. Sent as information copy.
3/23/87	Northridge	Engineering (External)	B.S.	A self-supporting program to be offered at the China Lake Naval Weapons Center. Concur.
3/23/87	Northridge	Counseling	M.S.	Proposes to expand current MA in Education-Counseling to a 60 unit MS degree with six possible areas of concentration. Discussion of demand in proposal could be stronger. Concur.
5/8/87	Stanislaus	Applied Studies	B.A.	A 2+2 program with lower-division technical prerequisites to be completed at a Community College or other institution. Concur.

Date	Campus	Program	Degree(s)	Commission Staff Comments

The California State University (continued)

6/25/87	San Bernardino	Industrial Technology	B.S.	Another 2+2 program that provides upper division courses in science, math, technology, and management for graduates of Community College voc/tech programs. Concur.

California Community Colleges

7/31/86	Citrus	Human Services	AA/Cert.	Concur.
8/19/86	Rancho Santiago	Home Health Aide	Cert.	Offered as certificate within existing nursing program. Concur.
8/19/86	Sacramento	Gerontology	AA/Cert.	Concur.
9/2/86	San Bernardino	Mill and Cabinet Work	Apprenticeship	Apprenticeship programs sent for information. No action.
9/9/86	Citrus	Technical Theater	AA/Cert.	Concur.
9/9/86	Santa Barbara	Water Science	--	Courses do not lead to a degree. No action.
9/9/86	MiraCosta	Micro-Computer Applications	AA	Concur.
10/3/86	Shasta	Residential Care Counselor	Cert.	Concur.
10/3/86	Santa Barbara	Ethnic Studies	AA	Program is already offered. No action.
10/3/86	Rio Honda	Manufacturing Technology	AA	Program can be offered with no additional faculty. Concur.
11/28/86	Mendocino	Electronics and Electric Technology	AA/Cert.	Concur.
2/2/87	Cañada	Microcomputer Technology	AA/Cert.	Program started and equipped as a GM/UAW training program. Concur.
2/2/87	Rancho Santiago	Nursing Home Health Aide	Cert.	As a certificate program based largely on existing courses, seems well-designed to serve as a step in the health occupation ladder. Concur.

California Community Colleges (continued)

Date	Campus	Program	Degree(s)	Commission Staff Comments
2/2/87	Glendale	Drug/Alcohol Abuse Specialist	AA/Cert.	Proposal shows proper concern for quality standards but evidence of job openings is thin. Concur.
2/2/87	Palomar	Mechanical Technology	AA/Cert.	Since the focus is on vacuum technology, that should be indicated in the title. Concur.
5/20/87	Feather River	Pack Station and Stable Operations	AA	Thorough, interesting proposal for a distinctive program offered for several years as an option. Concur.
5/20/87	South-western	Surgical Technology	AA	Convincing discussion of need. Concur.
6/5/87	Butte	Cardiovascular Technology	AA/Cert.	Good proposal. Concur.
6/5/87	Sierra	Fire Technology	AA/Cert.	Some effort to coordinate technical and academic courses for associate degree would have been in order here. Concur.
6/5/87	Lake Tahoe	Innkeeping: Food Technology Concentration	AA/Cert.	A natural addition to Hotel/Motel program. Proposal shows careful and responsible planning. Concur.
6/5/87	Victor Valley	Medical Assistant	Cert.	Most courses already offered. Concur.
6/5/87	Imperial Valley	Pharmacy Technician	Cert.	Proposal acceptable except for minimal number of credits required. Should be at least 24, not 15. Conditional concurrence.
6/5/87	Ohlone	Mechanical Technology	AA/Cert.	Superior proposal in all respects. Concur.
6/5/87	Santa Barbara	Recreation	AA/Cert.	Program has been offered as two-year certificate. Otherwise, questionable need. Concur.
6/5/87	Redwoods	Paralegal Studies	AA/Cert.	Excellent proposal. Intelligently planned program. Concur.
9/9/86	Columbia	Child Development	AA/Cert.	Concur.

Appendix B

Undergraduate Program Review Criteria,
College of Letters and Science,
University of California, Davis

College of Letters and Science
Teaching Program Planning and Review Committee

CRITERIA FOR EXAMINATION IN REVIEWS OF UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING PROGRAMS

(no ranking in importance is implied by the order of these criteria)

1. Appropriateness of the educational objectives of the department, and the department's role in the academic structure of the Davis Campus.
2. Professional competence of the teaching staff, including regular faculty, lecturers, and teaching assistants.
3. Balance in the faculty workload; extent of faculty contributions to program planning and review procedures.
4. Quality of the teaching; adequacy of the evaluation procedures used.
5. Grading practices and standards.
6. Academic or professional performance of the students after completing the program.
7. Quality of the curriculum; adequacy of methods of evaluating and revising it.
8. Quality of the service offerings, if any; extent of university or campus need for such courses that remains unfilled.
9. Form and adequacy of academic advising.
10. Availability of the faculty to undergraduate students.
11. Availability of student-run activities associated with the program.
12. Adequacy of the equipment, staffing and facilities available to the program.

Appendix C

Projected Programs, University of California and the California State University, 1986-1990

Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date
Agriculture and Natural Resources			
Science / Math*	M.A.T.	UC San Diego	1989
Aquatic Toxicology*	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Santa Cruz	1989-90
Plant Science	M.S.	CSU Fresno	1988
Landscape Irrigation Science*	B.S.	CSU Pomona	1988
Architecture			
School of Architecture*		UC San Diego	1988
Architecture*	B.A./M.Arch.	UC San Diego	1990
Architecture*	Ph.D.	UC San Diego	1991
Architecture	B.Arch.	San Diego State University	1989
Architecture	M.Arch.	San Diego State University	1992
Environmental Design*	M.S.	CSU San Luis Obispo	1989
Biological Sciences			
Biology*	M.A.T.	UC Davis	1989
Genetics*	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Riverside	1988
Biochemistry*	B.S.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Biochemistry*	B.S.	CSU Northridge	1990
Business and Management			
Management Information Systems*	M.S.	CSU Bakersfield	1991
Human Resource Development*	M.S.	CSU Chico	1989
Accountancy	M.S.	CSU Long Beach	1989
Taxation	M.S.	CSU Long Beach	1989
Computer Information Systems*	M.S.	CSU Los Angeles	1989
Accountancy*	M.A.	CSU San Bernardino	1989
Hotel and Restaurant Management	B.S.	San Francisco State University	1989
Accountancy	M.S.	San Francisco State University	1990
Accountancy*	M.S.	San Jose State University	1988
Taxation*	M.S.	San Jose State University	1988
Computer Information Systems	B.S.	CSU Stanislaus	1988
Communications			
Human Communication	Ph.D.	UC Santa Barbara	1989
Social & Behavioral Science Communication*	Grad. Certif.	UC Santa Cruz	1989
Social Documentation*	M.A.	UC Santa Cruz	1989
Telecommunications	B.S.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1989
Communications*	M.A.	CSU San Bernardino	1990
Computer Science			
Computer Science	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Santa Barbara	1988

Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date
Computer Engineering	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Santa Cruz	1988-89
Computer Science*	M.S.	CSU Bakersfield	1989
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1988
Computer Engineering	B.S.	CSU Fresno	1988
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Fresno	1988
Computer Engineering	B.S.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Hayward	1988
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Long Beach	1988
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Los Angeles	1988
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU San Bernardino	1989
Computer Engineering	M.S.	San Jose State University	1988
Computer Science	M.S.	CSU Stanislaus	1988
Education			
Education*	Ph.D.	UC Davis	1988
Educational Administration*	Ed.D.	UC Los Angeles	To be determined
Educational Leadership*	Ph.D.	UC Systemwide and CSU Fresno	To be determined
Educational Administration*	M.A.	CSU Bakersfield	1990
Child Development	B.A.	Humboldt State University	1988
Counseling	M.S.	Humboldt State University	1988
Tching Engl to Speakers of Other Langs	None listed	CSU Los Angeles	1988
Educational Administration*	M.A.	CSU San Bernardino	1988
Engineering			
Materials Science*	M.A./Ph.D.	UC San Diego	1988
Ocean Engineering*	B.S.	UC San Diego	1990
Ocean Engineering*	M.S.	UC San Diego	1994
Electronic Engineering	B.S.	UC Santa Cruz	1990-91
Electrical Engineering*	M.S.	CSU Chico	1988
Quality Assurance*	M.S.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1988
Construction Management	B.S.	CSU Fresno	1988
Civil Engineering	M.S.	CSU Fresno	1988
Civil Engineering	B.S./M.S.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Electrical Engineering	B.S./M.S	CSU Fullerton	1989
Mechanical Engineering	B.S./M.S.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Civil Engineering*	B.S.	Humboldt State University	1989
Engineering Technology*	B.S.	CSU Long Beach	1988
Engineering and Applied Math	Ph.D.	CSULB and Claremont	1989
Construction Management*	B.S.	CSU Sacramento	1988
Industrial Technology	B.S.	San Francisco State University	1988
Quality Assurance*	M.S.	San Jose State University	1988
Structural Engineering*	M.S.	CSU San Luis Obispo	1989
Fine and Performing Arts			
Music*	Ph.D.	UC Davis	1989
Dramatic Theory and Criticism*	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1989-90
Art History*	M.A.	UC Irvine	1989-90
Dance*	M.F.A.	UC Los Angeles	1988
Dance*	Ph.D.	UC Los Angeles	1990

Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date
Music	M.M.	UC Los Angeles	1989
Music	D.M.A.	UC Los Angeles	1989 or 1990
Music Theater	B.A.	UC Los Angeles	1989
Photographic Studies	M.A./M.F.A.	UC Riverside	1988
Art History / Criticism (Visual Arts)*	M.A./Ph.D.	UC San Diego	1990
Dramaturgy / Dramatic Literature*	Ph.D or DFA	UC San Diego	1991
Music	M.M./D.M.A.	UC Santa Barbara	1988
Music	B.A.	CSU Bakersfield	1989
Theatre Arts	B.A.	CSU Bakersfield	1990
Art	B.F.A.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1993
Theatre Arts*	M.F.A.	CSU Fresno	1990
Dance	B.A.	CSU Fullerton	1988
Dance*	B.F.A.	CSU Long Beach	1988
Dance*	M.F.A.	CSU Long Beach	1990
Music	M.M.	CSU Los Angeles	1988
Art*	B.F.A.	CSU Northridge	1989
Theatre Arts*	B.F.A.	CSU Northridge	1989
Art	B.F.A.	CSU Sacramento	1989
Art*	M.A.	CSU San Bernardino	1989
Dance*	B.A.	San Diego State University	1988
Drama	M.F.A.	San Francisco State University	1988
Music*	B.A.	CSU San Luis Obispo	1990
Art	B.F.A.	CSU Stanislaus	1989
Foreign Languages			
Japanese*	B.A.	UC Santa Barbara	1987-88
Japanese	B.A.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Japanese*	M.A.	San Francisco State University	1988
Health Professions			
Epidemiology*	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Davis	1988
Human Genetic Disease	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1989-90
Physical Therapy	M.S.	UCSF & SF State University	1988
Nursing*	B.S./M.S.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1988
Health Care Management	M.S.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1990
Physical Therapy*	M.P.T.	CSU Fresno	1988
Health Science	B.S.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Nursing*	M.S.	CSU Fullerton	1989
Physical Therapy*	M.P.T.	CSU Long Beach	1988
Health Care Administration	B.S./M.S.	CSU Long Beach	1988
Art Therapy	M.A.	CSU Los Angeles	1988
Physical Therapy*	M.P.T.	CSU Northridge	1988
Environmental and Occupational Health	B.S.	CSU Northridge	1983
Speech Pathology & Audiology	B.S.	CSU San Bernardino	1990
Gerontology	B.A.	San Diego State University	1988
Public Health	M.S.	San Diego State University	1988
Physical Therapy*	M.S.	San Diego State University	1989
Communicative Disorders	Ph.D.	San Diego State & USC	1989
Public Health*	Ph.D.	San Diego State & UCSD	1989

Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date
Physical Therapy	M.S.	SF State & UCSF (above)	1989
Gerontology	M.S.	San Jose State University	1989
Gerontology	M.S.	CSU Stanislaus	1989
Home Economics			
Nutritional Science	M.S.	CSU Chico	1988
Interdisciplinary			
Conservation and Resource Studies*	M.A./Ph.D.	UC Berkeley	1988
International Studies*	M.A./Ph.D.	UC Berkeley	1988
East Asian Languages and Literatures*	B.A.	UC Irvine	1990-91
East Asian Languages and Literatures*	M.A./Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1991-92
Environmental Health and Planning	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1989-90
HumanDevelopment*	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1989-90
Asian American Studies*	Specialization	UC Los Angeles	1988
Chinese Studies*	M.A.	UC San Diego	1989
Cognitive Science*	B.A.	UC San Diego	1989
International Relations & Pacific Studies*	Certificate	UC San Diego	1989
Japanese Studies	B.A./M.A.	UC San Diego	1992
Latin American Studies*	B.A./M.A.	UC San Diego	1990
Religious Studies*	B.A.	UC San Diego	1990
Environmental Studies*	M.A.	UC Santa Barbara	1988
Religious Studies*	B.A.	CSU Bakersfield	1988
Applied Studies*	B.S.	CSU Dominguez Hills	1988
Liberal Studies	M.A.	CSU Long Beach	1990
Asian Studies*	B.A./M.A.	CSU Los Angeles	1989
Aviation*	B.S.	CSU Los Angeles	1988
Asian Studies	B.A.	CSU Sacramento	1989
Liberal Studies	M.A.	CSU Sacramento	1989
Liberal Studies*	M.A.	CSU San Luis Obispo	1989
American Studies	B.A.	CSU Stanislaus	1988
General Studies	B.A.	CSU Stanislaus	1989
Letters			
Linguistics*	Ph.D.	UC Davis	1990
Classical Studies*	M.A.	UC San Diego	1993
Linguistics/Linguistic Discourse Analysis	M.A./Ph.D.	UC Santa Barbara	1988
Creative Writing*	M.F.A.	San Diego State University	1988
Linguistics	B.A.	San Jose State University	1988
Mathematics			
Statistics*	M.S.	UC Los Angeles	1988-89
Mathematics-Statistics (joint major)	B.S.	UC Santa Barbara	1988 or 1989
Statistics and Actuarial Science*	B.S.	UC Santa Barbara	1988 or 1989
Operations Research*	M.A.	UC Santa Barbara	1988 or 1989
Statistics or Applied Probability	Ph.D.	UC Santa Barbara	1988 or 1989
Mathematics*	M.A.T.	CSU San Bernardino	1988
Physical Sciences			
Geosciences*	M.S./Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1990-91

Program	Degree(s)	Campus	Date
Global Geosciences*	B.S.	UC San Diego	1990
Physical Science	B.S.	CSU Los Angeles	1988
Physics*	M.S.	CSU Sacramento	1989
Geology	B.S.	San Francisco State University	1988
Psychology			
Health and Clinical Psychology	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1990-91
Public Affairs and Services			
Criminology and Legal Studies*	B.A./M.A..	UC Irvine	1988-89
Criminology and Legal Studies*	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1990-91
Urban Planning*	M.A.	UC Irvine	1988-89
Urban Studies and Planning*	M.A.	UC San Diego	1989
Recreation Administration	B.A.	Humboldt State University	1988
Social Work*	M.S.W.	CSU San Bernardino	1989
Urban Studies*	B.A.	San Diego State University	1988
Social Sciences			
Anthropology*	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1991-92
Sociology*	Ph.D.	UC Irvine	1991-92
Anthropology*	B.S.	UC Los Angeles	1988-89
Economy and Society*	Ph.D.	UC Santa Barbara	1990
Anthropology	M.A./Ph.D.	UC Santa Cruz	1989
International Economics*	Ph.D.	UC Santa Cruz	1991-92
Social Science*	M.A.	CSU San Bernardino	1988

*Listed as projected program for first time.

References

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *The Commission's Role in the Review of Degree and Certificate Programs*. Commission Report 81-31. Sacramento: The Commission, December 1981.

--. *Annual Report on Program Review Activities, 1980-81*. Commission Report 82-18. Sacramento: The Commission, April 1982.

--. *Annual Summary of Program Review Activities, 1981-82*. Commission Report 83-24. Sacramento: The Commission, June 1983.

--. *Annual Summary of Program Review Activities, 1982-83*. Commission Report 84-29B. Sacramento: The Commission, July 1984.

--. *Annual Report on Program Review Activities, 1983-84*. Commission Report 85-32. Sacramento: The Commission, September 1985.

--. *Annual Report on Program Review Activities 1984-85*. Commission Report 86-20. Sacramento: The Commission, June 1986.

--. *Annual Report on Program Review Activities, 1985-86*. Commission Report 87-23. Sacramento: The Commission, June 1987.

Geertz, Clifford. "Blurred Genres." *American Scholar*, 49.2. Spring 1980, 165-179.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of January 1988, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach, *Chairperson*
Henry Der, San Francisco
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles, *Vice Chairperson*
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; appointed by the Regents of the University of California

William D. Campbell, Carlsbad; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University

Borgny Baird, Long Beach; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Kenneth L. Peters, Tarzana; appointed by the California State Board of Education

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by California's independent colleges and universities

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its interim executive director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514, telephone (916) 445-7933.

ANNUAL REPORT ON PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITIES, 1986-87

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 88-28

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

88-11 Eligibility for Freshman Admission to the University of California: A Statement to the Regents of the University by William H. Pickens, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 18, 1988 (March 1988)

88-12 Time to Degree in California's Public Universities: Factors Contributing to the Length of Time Undergraduates Take to Earn Their Bachelor's Degree (March 1988)

88-13 Evaluation of the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP): A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 2398 (Chapter 620, Statutes of 1984) (March 1988)

88-14 Standardized Tests Used for Higher Education Admission and Placement in California During 1987: The Third in a Series of Annual Reports Published in Accordance with Senate Bill 1758 (Chapter 1505, Statutes of 1984) (March 1988)

88-15 Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics Fall 1987: University of California, The California State University, and California's Independent Colleges and Universities (March 1988)

88-16 Legislative Update, March 1988: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1988)

88-17 State Policy for Faculty Development in California Public Higher Education: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1986 Budget Act (May 1988)

88-18 to 20 Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education: Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission by Berman, Weiler Associates:

88-18 Volume One: Executive Summary and Conclusions, by Paul Berman and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)

88-19 Volume Two: Findings, by Paul Berman, Jo-Ann Intili and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)

88-20 Volume Three: Appendix, by Paul Berman, Jo-Ann Intili, and Daniel Weiler, January 1988 (March 1988)

88-21 Staff Development in California's Public Schools: Recommendations of the Policy Development Committee for the California Staff Development Policy Study, March 16, 1988 (March 1988)

88-22 and 23 Staff Development in California: Public and Personal Investments, Program Patterns, and Policy Choices, by Judith Warren Little, William H. Gerritz, David S. Stern, James W. Guthrie, Michael W. Kirst, and David D. Marsh. A Joint Publication of Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development • Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), December 1987:

88-22 Executive Summary (March 1988)

88-23 Report (March 1988)

88-24 Status Report on Human Corps Activities: The First in a Series of Five Annual Reports to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 1820 (Chapter 1245, Statutes of 1987) (May 1988)

88-25 Proposed Construction of the Petaluma Center of Santa Rosa Junior College: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request for Capital Funds for Permanent Off-Campus Center in Southern Sonoma County (May 1988)

88-26 California College-Going Rates, 1987 Update: The Eleventh in a Series of Reports on New Freshman Enrollments at California's Colleges and Universities by Recent Graduates of California High Schools (June 1988)

88-27 Proposed Construction of Off-Campus Community College Centers in Western Riverside County: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request of the Riverside and Mt. San Jacinto Community College Districts for Capital Funds to Build Permanent Off-Campus Centers in Norco and Moreno Valley and South of Sun City (June 1988)

88-28 Annual Report on Program Review Activities, 1986-87: The Twelfth in a Series of Reports to the Legislature and the Governor on Program Review by Commission Staff and California's Public Colleges and Universities (June 1988)